

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

IN RE REMBRANDT TECHNOLOGIES, LP	:	
PATENT LITIGATION	:	C.A. 07-md-1848(GMS)
	:	
	:	
Civil Action No. 07-cv-399-GMS	:	
ONLY	:	
	:	
MOTOROLA, INC., ET AL.	:	C.A. No. 07-752 (GMS)
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
REMBRANDT TECHNOLOGIES, LP	:	
	:	
	:	
SHARP CORPORATION and SHARP	:	
ELECTRONICS CORPORATION	:	JURY TRIAL
	:	DEMANDED
v.	:	
	:	
REMBRANDT TECHNOLOGIES, LP	:	
	:	

STIPULATION CONCERNING PLEADINGS

WHEREAS, by Order entered June 18, 2007, the Judicial Panel on Multi-District Litigation consolidated certain actions before this Court for pre-trial proceedings, MDL Docket No. 07-md-1848 (GMS) (the “MDL proceeding”), including an action between Rembrandt Technologies, LP (“Rembrandt”), on the one hand, and Sharp Corporation and Sharp Electronics Corporation (collectively, “Sharp”), on the other, concerning U.S. Patent No. 5,243,627 (the “’627 patent”), which was assigned Civil Action No. 07-cv-399-GMS within the MDL proceeding;

WHEREAS, on November 1, 2007, certain equipment manufacturers commenced Civil Action No. 07-cv-752-GMS against Rembrandt Technologies, LP (“the Delaware

Action”), asserting, *inter alia*, the invalidity and non-infringement of eight patents other than the ‘627 patent involved in the MDL proceeding;

WHEREAS, on March 7, 2008, Sharp intervened in the Delaware Action, asserting certain causes of action concerning the ‘627 patent;

WHEREAS, on March 27, 2008, Rembrandt joined issue on Sharp’s claims in the Delaware Action and brought certain counterclaims against Sharp;

WHEREAS, on April 16, 2008, Sharp replied to Rembrandt’s counterclaims; and

WHEREAS, on May 5, 2008, Rembrandt amended its pleadings in the Delaware Action in response to amended claims made by parties other than Sharp to include claims against Sharp that had already been asserted in the Delaware Action in response to Sharp’s intervenor complaint and to which Sharp had previously responded;

NOW, THEREFORE, in order to avoid further submission of duplicative pleadings regarding Rembrandt’s claims for patent infringement and unnecessary complexities in the state of those pleadings, Rembrandt and Sharp hereby stipulate, subject to the approval of the Court, that Sharp’s claims and defenses previously asserted in the Delaware Action are incorporated by reference as responses to Rembrandt’s most recent claims for patent infringement in the Delaware Action and Sharp is not required to file further responses to those claims.

CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP

/s/ Francis DiGiovanni

Collins J. Seitz, Jr. (#2237)
Francis DiGiovanni (#3189)
James D. Heisman (#2746)
Kristen Healey Cramer (#4512)
1007 N. Orange Street
Wilmington, Delaware 19899
(302) 658-9141
cseitz@cblh.com
fdigiovanni@cblh.com
jheisman@cblh.com
kcramer@cblh.com

Counsel for Rembrandt Technologies, LP

DAY PITNEY LLP

/s/ Richard H. Brown

Richard H. Brown
Gerald A. Levy
Yukio Kashiba
Jonathan B. Tropp
7 Times Square
New York, NY
(212) 297-5800
rbrown@daypitney.com
glevy@daypitney.com
ykashiba@daypitney.com
jbtropp@daypitney.com

*Counsel for Sharp Corporation and
Sharp Electronics Corporation*